

Application Serial No. 10/666,883

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected all pending claims. Applicant hereby amends claims 1, 3, 8, 9, 14, 16, 18, 21-23 and 25-26 to more clearly define the inventive subject matter.

The Examiner rejected claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being dependent on itself. Applicant inadvertently labeled claim 17 as claim 16, and thus inadvertently mislabeled all subsequent claims. Applicant apologizes for this error, which was the source of the ambiguity concerning claim 23. All claims are correctly renumbered herein, and claims are amended as needed to correct all dependencies.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6 and 14-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Overton. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 1 as amended recites "providing a...database ... that contains cross references from service provider resource identifiers to service provider resource information...comprising at least a universal resource locator (URL) and substantive descriptive information concerning the resource" and "[using] a fixed service provider resource identifier...having a one to one correspondence with an associated service provider resource....[to] access...said database using said extracted service provider resource identifier and retrieving associated service provider resource information from said database." In other words, the inventive subject matter as recited in claim 1 utilizes a fixed resource identifier which has a one to one correspondence with an associated resource to access the URL of the resource, as well substantive descriptive information concerning the resource. This allows consistent access to resources through fixed identifiers, even where resources are moved or modified.

Application Serial No. 10/666,883

The above described limitations are neither disclosed nor suggested by Overton. Instead, Overton describes locating all data concerning a specific entity stored in a distributed database. See [0008], [0039] and [0044]. Overton's "entity identifier" is associated with "zero or more data locations" for data concerning the entity. See [0039]. This allows the NDTP server to return "a list of all [data] locations for the specified entity." This allows subsequent access of all the data concerning the entity, said data residing throughout a distributed database. See [0040].

Thus, the "entity identifier" is not equivalent to the "fixed service provider resource identifier...*having a one to one correspondence with an associated service provider resource*" as recited by claim 1 (emphasis added). Overton's entity identifier is associated with all the data concerning the specified entity. This allows subsequent access of all the data concerning the entity, which can reside at multiple locations throughout a distributed database. On the other hand, the fixed service provider resource identifier recited by claim 1 has a one to one mapping with the resource itself.

Furthermore, as recited by claim 1, each "fixed service provider resource identifier" is mapped to "resource information... comprising at least a universal resource locator (URL) *and substantive descriptive information concerning the resource*" (emphasis added). On the other hand, Overton's "entity identifier" is associated only with "data locations" for data concerning the entity. See [0039], [0045], [0056] and [0151]. The Examiner's assertion that "geographical resource information such as Chicago or Paris...is equivalent to Applicant's 'resource descriptor' " is mistaken, because Overton does not disclose "resource information such as Chicago or Paris" as part of the location information. Overton states that "A client at a Paris location...may

Application Serial No. 10/666,883

request...location information...and receive a URL for [a server] residing in Chicago.”

[0151]. Note that the client who happens to be located in Paris receives only a URL for a server that happens to be in Chicago. The client does not receive any geographical resource information such as Chicago or Paris, much less *substantive descriptive information concerning the resource*” as recited by claim 1.

These distinctions are substantive. Overton enables a server “to answer the question: Where is data associated with a particular entity in a distributed database system.” [0044]. The user requests information on a topic, and Overton returns a list of locations where that information can be found. There is no resource that a user is trying to access; instead the user wishes to look at all available information about a topic. Applicant’s invention as recited by claim 1 uses a fixed identifier to glean potentially dynamic information concerning a resource. The user does not look up information on a topic, but instead accesses a dynamic resource by using a fixed identifier. These are different problems, and as explained above they are solved in different ways, through the use of different mechanisms and methodologies.

Claims 1-7 dependent from claim 1 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 14-20 are apparatus claims similar in scope to claims 1-7, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1-7. Although moot in light of the above, for the record Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner’s assertion that the additional recited limitations of the dependent claims are all anticipated by Overton.

The Examiner rejected claims 8, 10, 12, 13, 20, 22, 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Teare. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 8, as amended, recites using “a fixed service provider resource identifier having a

Application Serial No. 10/666,883

one to one correspondence with an associated service provider resource” to provide access to said resource. In other words, the inventive subject matter as recited in claim 8 utilizes a fixed resource identifier which has a one to one correspondence with an associated resource to access the resource. This allows consistent access to resources through fixed identifiers, even where resources are moved or modified. Although the resource can change, the identifier is fixed, and each resource is associated with one and only one identifier.

The above described limitations are neither disclosed nor suggested by Teare. Instead, Teare describes receiving a request in any of a plurality of natural languages (e.g., English, Japanese, Russian, etc.) for information concerning a network component. See col. 7, lines 34-42, col. 9, lines 5-21. Teare then uses the received network resource name (which can be in any supported language) to locate information concerning the resource, and returns the information to a user. See col. 9, lines 49-55, col. 20, lines 20-35. In Teare, more than one resource can match the query, in which case information on multiple network components is returned to the requester. See col. 21, lines 24-27, col. 21, lines 39-62.

Thus, Teare clearly lacks the “fixed service provider resource identifier having a one to one correspondence with an associated service provider resource” of claim 8. Teare’s “network resource name” is not equivalent to the recited identifier, because in Teare multiple network resource names (e.g., the name of a resource in English, the name of the resource in Japanese, etc.) are used to search for information concerning the resource. Teare’s resource names are not single fixed identifiers, each with a one to one match with a single network resource. On the contrary, many different names correspond

Application Serial No. 10/666,883

to the same resource. Additionally, a single name can correspond to multiple resources. As Teare puts it "[the Resolver receives] one or more entries from the Index 30 that correspond to the requested real name" see col. 21, lines 25-27.

These distinctions are substantive. Teare enables a server to receive a request in any supported natural language, and provide information on any network resources that match the request. There is a many to many, two way correspondence between resource names and network resources. Applicant's invention as recited by claim 8 uses a fixed identifier with a one to one correspondence to a single resource to glean potentially dynamic information concerning that resource.

Claims 9-13 dependent from claim 8 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 8. Claims 21-26 are apparatus claims similar in scope to claims 8-13, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 8-13. Although moot in light of the above, for the record Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's assertion that the additional recited limitations of the dependent claims are all anticipated by Teare.

The Examiner rejected claims 9, 11, 21 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious in light of a hypothetical combination of Overton and Teare. Claims 9, 11, 21 and 23 all dependent from an independent claim discussed above, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Although moot in light of the above, for the record Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's assertion that there exists a motivation to combine Overton and Teare, and that such a hypothetical combination would disclose or suggest the claimed limitations.

Application Serial No. 10/666,883

Applicant respectfully posits that the pending claims have been distinguished from the art of record. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all claims as amended. If the Examiner would like to discuss this matter, Applicant's attorney can be reached at 650-474-8400.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jeffrey Brill", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jeffrey Brill
Reg. No. 51,198
Glenn Patent Group

Customer No. 22,862